

## REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed on May 1, 2007. This paper amends claims 1, 10 and 19. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-19 will be pending.

### I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner is unclear how a user registration page request can be submitted to a user registration page and, further, how a registration page can merge security requirements with user profile registration requirements. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10 and 19 to specify that the user registration page request is submitted to the web application and, further, that the web application is responsible for the merging. Applicant submits that such amendments overcome these rejections and request the same.

### II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 10-11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,855 to Hunt et al (hereafter "Hunt"). In order for a reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. For the several reasons recited below, it is respectfully submitted that that Hunt does not anticipate any of the claims.

#### **A. Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 are not anticipated by Hunt**

1. *Hunt still fails to disclose that an application server embeds security registration data requirements in the user registration page request.*

In regards to amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Hunt still fails to disclose "by the application server, embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request and forwarding the user registration page request to the web application." As previously stated in the response dated February 15, 2007, col. 7, lines 28-37 and col. 8, lines 15-26 of Hunt fail to disclose this limitation of claim 1. Specifically, these portions of Hunt merely disclose that a new user chooses a user name and password which is required on all subsequent visits to the registration site. See *Hunt*, col. 7, lines 43-45. These portions of Hunt also fail to disclose that an application server is responsible for embedding security requirements into the user registration page request. As stated above, Hunt discloses that a password field is included on the registration page, however, there is no mention of the password request being embedded into the user registration page request

by an application server. Nor that the user registration page request is forwarded to the web application. Therefore, these portions of Hunt fail to disclose this limitation of claim 1.

The Office action has further cited to col. 5, line 56 – col. 6, line 31 of Hunt in support for Hunt disclosing, “by the application server, embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request and forwarding the user registration page request to the web application.” Applicant respectfully submits that this portion of Hunt also fails to disclose this limitation of claim 1. The additionally cited portion of Hunt merely discloses the submission of registration data to a website on behalf of a user, thereby automating the registration process which is normally reserved for the user to perform manually. See *Hunt*, col. 6, lines 6-9. This portion of Hunt further discloses methods for submitting the registration information to the target registration site (e.g., using javascript to fill out the site’s forms, proxying form submission, HTTP GET and POST requests to the URI, etc.) See *Hunt*, col. 5, lines 56-67. Submitting registration information to a website on behalf of a user is not the same as embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request which is then forwarded to the web application. Therefore, Hunt still fails to disclose this limitation of claim 1.

Additionally, Applicant resubmits its previous arguments that Hunt also fails to disclose other limitations of claim 1 since the Office action does not provide a response to the arguments nor cites to additional language in Hunt to support a 35 U.S.C. § 102 claim.

*2. Hunt fails to disclose that the web application merges the security data requirements with the user profile registration requirements.*

Claim 1 further states that, “by the web application, merging the security registration data requirements from the application server with user profile registration requirements of the web application to form a user information request page.” As stated above, Hunt fails to disclose that an application server is responsible for embedding security requirements into the user registration page request. Therefore, the web application would be unable to merge the security registration requirements from the application server. As such, Hunt fails to disclose this limitation of claim 1.

*3. Hunt fails to disclose that an application server extracts security data from a filled out user information page.*

Claim 1 further states that, “extracting security data from the filled out user information page by the application server.” The Office action holds that the mere disclosure of Hunt using an ID and password is sufficient to meet this limitation. The Office action further points to col. 5, lines 12-24, col. 6, lines 44-52 and col. 8, lines 15-42 as support. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Hunt discloses this limitation of claim 1. First, the mere disclosure that Hunt use an ID and password is insufficient. Many methods for extracting security data from a user registration page are possible. Hence, without an explicit

indication of its method, it cannot be implied from Hunt that an application server is responsible for this extraction.

Second, the cited language in Hunt does not disclose this limitation of claim 1. Hunt discloses that a web server stores user profiles in a database. See *Hunt*, col. 5, lines 12-24. Further, Hunt discloses what type of information is stored in a user profile, including ID and password. See *Hunt*, col. 6, lines 44-52. However, the mere inclusion of an ID and password in a user profile is insufficient to infer that an application server extracted security data from a user information page. As stated above, multiple methods for extracting security data from a user information page are possible. It is not sufficient to imply that an application server is responsible for this task. Lastly, Hunt discloses the process for a user to register with a website. See *Hunt*, col. 8, lines 15-42. However, no mention of an application server extracting security data from a user information page is disclosed. Therefore, Hunt fails to disclose this limitation of claim 1. As such, claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hunt.

As set forth above, Independent claims 10 and 19 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hunt. Claims 10 and 19 substantially include the same limitations of claim 1, namely, "by the application server, embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request and forwarding the user registration page request to the web application" and "extracting security data from the filled out user information page by the application server." For at least the reasons cited above with respect to claim 1, Hunt does not disclose all the limitations of claims 10 and 19. Thus, claims 10 and 19 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hunt.

#### **B. Dependent claims 2 and 11 are not anticipated by Hunt**

Dependent claims 2 and 11 depend upon and contain all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Therefore, for at least the reasons mentioned above, Hunt does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 2 and 11. As such, claims 2 and 11 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hunt.

#### **III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3-5, 7-9, 12-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt and in further view of U.S. Patent No 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. (hereafter "Levergood"). A prima facie case of obviousness requires that a reference or combination of references "teach or suggest all of the claim limitations." See MPEP § 2143. For the several reasons recited below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Hunt and Levergood do not make any of the above listed claims obvious.

Dependent claims 3-5, 7-9, 12-14 and 16-18 depend upon and include all the limitations of claims 1 and 10, respectively. As stated above, Hunt does not disclose each

and every limitation of claims 1 and 10. As Levergood does not disclose, "by the application server, embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request and forwarding the user registration page request to the web application", applicants also submit that Levergood does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the combination of Hunt and Levergood also fails to disclose each and every limitation of claims 1 and 10. As such, claims 3-5, 7-9, 12-14 and 16-18 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Hunt and Levergood.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the application. The Applicant respectfully submits the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

The Applicant believes no fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefore and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 as necessary.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated: July 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory P. Durbin, Registration No. 42,503  
Attorney for Applicant  
USPTO Customer No. 66083

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
Republic Plaza Building, Suite 4700  
370 Seventeenth Street  
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647  
Phone: (303) 629-3400  
Fax: (303) 629-3450